

REMARKS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the above-mentioned Official Action in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3-13, 15, 16, 50, 51, 55, and 56 are now pending in the application, with Claims 1 and 50 being independent. Claims 1 and 50 have been amended and Claims 55 and 56 are newly-presented herein. Support for the amendments to the independent claims can be found in the original specification at least at page 54, line 20 to page 55, line 3. Support for the features of the new claims can be found in the specification at least at page 26, lines 12-17. Of course, the claims are not intended to be limited in scope to these preferred embodiments.

Applicants also renew the request that withdrawn Claims 50 and 51 (and now new Claim 56) be rejoined and allowed with the examined claims. Features similar to those added to apparatus Claim 1 have been also added to method Claim 50. Accordingly, it cannot be said that the claimed process can be practiced by a materially different apparatus or by hand, or that the claimed apparatus can be used to practice a materially different method. It is also respectfully submitted that no undue burden will be placed on the Examiner to consider these additional claims. Favorable consideration is requested.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,226,886 (Lakes) in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,971,315 (Hansen). Claims 5 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Lakes and Hansen and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,326,180 (Lofgren). Claims 8, 10, 11, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lakes and Hansen in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,213,751 (Terry). Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lakes and Hansen in view U.S. Patent No. 3,009,440 (Kent). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Office Action takes the position that “the liquid as recited initially in the preamble of the claim and then referred to in the body of the claim has been merely read as being intended to be used with the device.” Without conceding the propriety of this position, the liquid is no longer referred to in the preambles of Claims 1 and 50 and should not be simply read as being intended to be used with the device or method. As discussed previously, Lakes is silent about the components of the liquid used in its stamp pad. Lakes fails to disclose or suggest at least a liquid being at least one selected from a group consisting of fatty acid ester, silicon oil, modified silicon, and fluorinated oil, as is recited in independent Claims 1 and 50.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that it would not be obvious to combine such a claim liquid with the claimed porous film. By using a highly viscous liquid, such as those recited in the claims, with a porous film having the claimed pore size, it can be insured that the most effective amount of liquid can be transferred to the printed surface. Note Applicants specification at page 35, lines 14-17, page 41, lines 24-27, page 49, lines 7-10, and page 54, line 27 to page 57, line 5.

Furthermore, Lakes does not disclose or suggest supplying the liquid to the

printed product by a depression force applied through a lid (Claim 1) or transferring the liquid supplied through the restricting portion ... by applying a depression force through a lid that covers the printed product (Claim 50).

Thus, Lakes fails to disclose or suggest important features of the present invention recited in the independent claims.

Th remaining citations have been reviewed, but are not believed to remedy the deficiencies of Lakes noted above with respect to the independent claims.

Thus, independent Claims 1 and 50 are patentable over the citations of record. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection are respectfully requested.

This Amendment After Final Rejection, is an earnest attempt to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues, and is believed to clearly place this application in condition for allowance. This Amendment was not earlier presented because Applicants earnestly believed that the prior Amendment placed the subject application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, entry of this Amendment under 37 CFR 1.116 is respectfully requested.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention is patentably defined by independent Claims 1 and 50. Dependent Claims 3-13, 15, 16, 51 55, and 56 are also allowable, in their own right, for defining features of the present invention in addition to those recited in their respective independent claims. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark A. Williamson/

Mark A. Williamson
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 33,628

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
MAW:ytr

FCIS_WS 1465106v1